

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/023,888 | 12/21/2001 | William Canfield | 203515US77 | 5416 |
| · | 08/30/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | SLOBODYANSKY, ELIZABETH | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1652 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Second Advisory Action | 10/023,888 | CANFIELD ET AL. | | | | |
| Carry navious notion | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD | 1652 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee unde 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>08 June 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>26,30-32,34,71-74,76,81,82 and 91-94</u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>22,56 and 74</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>26,28-37 and 70-73</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 54,55 and 75-95 | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 12/22/03; 2/21/02. | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | 8. Sloboolyacester Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD | | | | |
| | | Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1652 | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 2. NOTE: Amended claims 35 and 86 do not have support for "histidine-tyrosine" proteolytic site. The specification indicates Genenase I proteolytic site as SEQ ID NO:38 (page 9). Further, the Biolabs catalog indicates more than two residues necessary for the Genenase I specificity. Moreover, Genenase I does not cleave bond between histidine and tyrosine.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 83 recites "soluble" without antecedent basis. Claims 70 and 90 recite enzymes that are not listed in the Enzyme Nomenclature. Claim 95 is drawn to a method of use of the polypeptide of claim 26 while reciting the method of making of a different compound.

NOTE: IDS of 2/21/02, "BW" reference was considered and is now initialed (page 2 of 11)